

Appln. No. 10/782,070  
Amendment dated June 17, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 18, 2005

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1 through 4 and 7 through 17 remain in this application. Claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

#### Part 1 of the Office Action

The specification has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The specification has been amended in a manner believed to provide antecedent basis for the opaque nature of the longitudinal dividers shown in the drawing.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### Part 2 of the Office Action

Claims 5 and 16 have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim 5 has been cancelled, and claim 16 has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informality in the language.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 16 respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/782,070  
Amendment dated June 17, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 18, 2005

**Parts 3 and 4 of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4 through 6, and 13 through 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeWitt in view of Peickert.

Claims 2, 3, and 15 through 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeWitt in view of Peickert and further in view of Folsom.

Claims 7 through 12 have been rejected on bases similar to claims 1 through 6 and 13 through 17.

Claim 7 has been amended to positively recite the bead containers as suggested in the Office Action, and requires "a plurality of bead containers having a substantially uniform size of approximately 14 mm by approximately 60 mm". It is submitted that claim 7, as well as claims 8 through 12 which depend from claim 7, are allowable over the prior art.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, also requires "a plurality of bead containers having a substantially uniform size of approximately 14 mm by approximately 60 mm" and "wherein said housing is rectangular, said housing having a length of approximately 12 inches, said housing having a width of approximately 8 inches, said housing having a height of approximately 3 inches, said length, width, and height being selected for storing up to seventy-two plastic bead containers having a uniform size of approximately 14 mm by approximately 60 mm". It is submitted that claim 1, as amended, also defines over the prior art, and that claim 1, as well as claims 2 through 4 and 13 through 17, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 4 and 7 through 17 is therefore respectfully requested.


Appln. No. 10/782,070  
Amendment dated June 17, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 18, 2005

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By   
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.  
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807  
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931

Date: JUNE 17, 2005